

## **Remarks**

### **Claim Amendments**

Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove “solvates” and “hydrates,” and have amended claim 8 to replace “halide” with “compound.”

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

It is noted that the Office has rejected claims 1-6 for allegedly failing to particularly point out or distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office has rejected claims 1-6 because the term “hydrate” is allegedly confusing. Applicants have removed the word “hydrate” from claim 1.

Furthermore, the Office has rejected claims 8 and 9 because the term “halide of formula (1)” is allegedly confusing. Applicants have removed the words “halide of” and replaced them with the word “compound.”

The Office has also rejected claims 1-6 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement, because claim 1 include “hydrates”, and “hydrates are unpredictable because there are different hydrates.” Applicants believe that the amendments made above, including the removal of “hydrate” from claim 1, satisfies this rejection.

Additionally, the Office has rejected claims 1-6 as allegedly not being enabling for making solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds. Applicants believe that the amendments made above, including removing “solvates” and “hydrates” from claim 1, fully addresses this rejection.

## **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. The Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned as indicated below if the Examiner believes that this would expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2008

By: /Marcia Ireland Rosenfeld/  
Marcia Ireland Rosenfeld  
Reg. No. 60,679

McDonnell Bochnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP  
300 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 913-3319